

SPARSISTENT ESTIMATION OF TIME-VARYING DISCRETE MARKOV RANDOM FIELDS

BY MLADEN KOLAR AND ERIC P. XING *

School of Computer Science, Carnegie Mellon University

We study a nonparametric method that estimates the structure of a discrete undirected graphical model from data. We assume that the distribution generating the data smoothly evolves over time and that the given sample is not identically distributed. Under the assumption that the underlying graphical model is sparse, the method recovers the structure consistently in the high dimensional, low sample size setting.

1. Introduction. Consider the following real world problems:

- *Analysis of gene regulatory networks.* Suppose that we have a set of n microarray measurements of gene expression levels, obtained at different stages during the development of an organism or at different times during the cell cycle. Given this data, biologists would like to get insight into dynamic relationships between different genes and how these relations change at different stages of development. The problem is that at each time point there is only one or at most a few measurements of the gene expressions; and a naive approach to estimating the gene regulatory network, which uses only the data at the time point in question to infer the network, would fail. To obtain a good estimate of the regulatory network at any time point, we need to leverage the data collected at other time points and extract some information from them.
- *Analysis of stock market.* In a finance setting, we have values of different stocks at each time point. Suppose, for simplicity, that we only measure whether the value of a particular stock is going up or down. We would like to find the underlying transient relational patterns between different stocks from these measurements and get insight into how do these patterns change over time. Again, we only have one measurement at each time point and we need to leverage information from the data obtained at nearby time points.
- *Understanding social networks.* There are 100 Senators in the U.S. Senate and each can cast a vote on different bills. Suppose that we are

*To whom corresponds should be addressed.

given n voting records over some period of time. How can one infer the latent political liaisons and coalitions among different senators and the way these relationships change with respect to time and with respect to different issues raised in bills just from the voting records?

What is common to the above described problems is that they all concern with estimating a sequence of time-specific latent relational structures between a fixed set of entities (i.e., variables), from a time series of observation data of entities states; and the relational structures between the entities are time evolving, rather than being invariant throughout the data collection period as commonly assumed in nearly all previous work on structure estimation such as [5, 19, 21, 22]. Typically, the available data for the problem are very scarce, with only one or at most a few measurements per time point corresponding to any particular latent structure; and the data are very high-dimensional, with the total number of observations small compared to the total number of potential relations, which make the problem of structure estimation even more challenging than the static case studied recently by [21].

A popular model for the relational structure over a fixed set of entities that is widely studied is the Markov random field (MRF) [16, 26]. Let $G = (V, E)$ represent a graph, of which V denotes the set of vertices, and E denotes the set of edges over vertices. Depending on the specific application of interest, a node $u \in V$ can represent a gene, a stock, or a social actor, and an edge $(u, v) \in E$ can represent a relationship (e.g., correlation, influence, friendship) between actors u and v . Let $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_p)'$, where $p = |V|$, be a random vector of nodal states following a probability distribution indexed by $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$. Under a MRF, the nodal states X_u 's are assumed to be discrete, i.e., $X_u \in \mathcal{X} \equiv \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$, and the edge set $E \subseteq V \times V$ encodes certain conditional independence assumptions among components of the random vector $\mathbf{X}$, for example, the random variable X_u is conditionally independent of the random variable X_v given the rest of the variables if $(u, v) \notin E$. Under the special case of binary nodal states, e.g., $X_u \in \mathcal{X} \equiv \{-1, 1\}$, and assuming pairwise potential weighted by θ_{uv} for all $(u, v) \in E$ and $\theta_{uv} = 0$ for all $(u, v) \notin E$, the joint probability of $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ can be expressed by a simple exponential family model: $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp\{\sum_{u < v} \theta_{uv} x_u x_v\}$, also known as the Ising model, where Z denotes the partition that is usually intractable to compute. A number of recent papers have studied in depth how to estimate this model from data that are assumed to be *i.i.d.* samples from the model, and the asymptotic guarantee of the estimator [5, 21]. In particular, an important focus has been on the problem of *structure estimation* of the graph topology represented by E . It has been shown that under certain

variable conditions, it is possible to obtain an estimator of the edge set E that achieve a property known as *sparsistency* [21], which refers to the case where a consistent estimator of E can be attained when the true degree (i.e., number of neighbors) of each node is much smaller than the size of the graph p .

In this paper, we are interested in learning the graph structures of MRFs from observational data, but under a more demanding scenario where the data $\{\mathbf{x}^t\}$ are not *i.i.d.* samples from a time-invariant MRF, but from a series of time-evolving MRFs $\{\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^t}(\cdot)\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n}$, where $\mathcal{T}_n = \{1/n, 2/n, \dots, 1\}$ is the time index set; and our goal is to estimate the sequence of graphs $\{G^t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n}$ underlying each observation $\mathbf{x}^t \sim \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^t}$ in the time series, rather than a single static graph G underlying $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ over all time points. Under the traditional assumption of data sampled *i.i.d.* from an invariant $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, structural estimation of a MRF can be cast as a *neighborhood selection* problem for each node in the graph based on a ℓ_1 -norm regularized regression procedure, of which the theoretical guarantees have been recently thoroughly studied [21], as we review shortly. We instead focus on estimating the graph structures from a set of n independent, high-dimensional observations which are NOT identically distributed, which is arguably a more realistic characteristic of the data. We will assume that the probability distribution generating observations changes *smoothly* over time, which is a critical assumption that allow us to infer graphs with time-varying structure and get insight into the dynamics of the relational changes. Because of this more general problem we are near the extremum of the high- p /low- n scenario for high-dimensional inference in the traditional sense, (i.e., n is approaching 1, corresponding to as few as 1 instance of $\mathbf{x}$ per time-specific MRF), it is intriguing to ask, can we reliably estimate the changing graph structure and, if so, under what conditions?

It is noteworthy that the problem of the graph structure estimation is quite different from the problem of (value-) consistent estimation of the unknown parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ that indexes the distribution. In general, the graph structure estimation requires a more stringent assumptions on the underlying distribution and the parameter values. For example, observe that a consistent estimator of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ in the Euclidean distance does not guarantee a consistent estimation of the graph structure, encoded by the non-zero pattern of the estimator. In the motivating problems that we started with, the main goal is to understand the interactions between different actors. These interactions are more easily interpreted by a domain expert than the numerical values of the parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and have potential to reveal more information about the underlying process of interest. This is especially true in situations where there is little or no domain knowledge and one is inter-

ested in obtaining casual, preliminary information.

1.1. *The Model.* Given n observations from time series of nodal states $\{\mathbf{x}^t\}$, which are assumed for simplicity to be equidistant in time, we write the time index set as $\mathcal{T}_n = \{1/n, 2/n, \dots, 1\}$, and denote by $\mathcal{D}_n = \{\mathbf{x}^t \sim \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^t} | t \in \mathcal{T}_n\}$ a sample, where each data point comes from a different discrete time step and is distributed according to a distribution $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^t}$ indexed by $\boldsymbol{\theta}^t$. Specifically, we assume that the p -dimensional random vector $\mathbf{X}^t$ takes values in $\{-1, 1\}^p$ and the probability distribution takes the following form:

$$(1) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^t}(x) = \frac{1}{Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}^t)} \exp \left(\sum_{(u,v) \in E^t} \theta_{uv}^t x_u x_v \right), \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}_n,$$

where $Z(\boldsymbol{\theta}^t)$ is the partition function, $\boldsymbol{\theta}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{\binom{p}{2}}$ is the parameter vector and $G^t = (V, E^t)$ is an undirected graph representing certain conditional independence assumptions among subsets of the p -dimensional random vector $\mathbf{X}^t$. The problem we are addressing is:

For every given time point $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_n$, estimate the graph structure G^τ associated with $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^\tau}$, given the observations $\mathcal{D}_n$. Indeed, our algorithm and analysis apply more generally to $\tau \in [0, 1]$, i.e., the estimator does not have to be overlapping in time with the samples.

Since we are primarily interested in a situation where the total number of observation n is small compared to the dimension p , and at each time point there is only one realization of the random variable, we will have to impose some regularity conditions on the distribution generating the observations and on the rate of change of parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}^t$ with respect to time in order to reliably estimate the graph structure G^τ . We will impose two natural assumptions: the *sparsity* of the graphs $\{G^t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n}$, and the *smoothness* of the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}^t$ as functions of time, which we give in Section 3. Compared to the estimation of the graph structure from an *i.i.d.* sample [21], the main technical difficulty we have to deal with is the graph structure that changes over time. In order to analyze the problem in a sensible asymptotic framework, we need to assume that the graph structure “locally” does not change too much and, as the sample size grows, there are enough samples to estimate the graph structure in some small neighborhood.

The model given in Eq. (1) can be thought of as a nonparametric extension of conventional MRFs, in the similar way as the varying-coefficient models [8, 17] are thought of as an extension to the linear regression models. The difference between the model given in Eq. (1) and an MRF model is that our model allows for parameters to change, while in MRF the parameters are considered fixed. Allowing parameters to vary over time increases

the expressiveness of the model, and make it more suitable for longitudinal network data. For simplicity of presentation, in this paper we consider time-varying MRFs with only pairwise potentials as in Eq. (1). Note that in the case of discrete MRFs there is no loss of generality by considering only pairwise interactions, since any MRF with higher-order interactions can be represented with an equivalent MRF with pairwise interactions [26].

1.2. Related Work. As mentioned in the introduction, most existing work on structure estimation assumes a fixed graphical model over *i.i.d.* data. In addition to the MRF model mentioned above for discrete cases, the Gaussian graphical model (GGM) has been a standard model for continuous-valued nodal states, in which the state vector $\mathbf{x}$ follows a multivariate Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$, and the non-zero pattern of the concentration matrix encodes the *structure* of the GGM. Under the assumption that the graph structure does not change with time, there has been a large (and growing) body of literature that deals with estimation of the concentration matrix from *i.i.d.* observational data. These methods can be roughly summarized into two categories: consistent estimation of the concentration matrix in a given matrix norm, and consistent estimation of the non-zero pattern of the concentration matrix. The first group of methods include penalized estimation methods [2, 11, 12, 14, 23, 28], while the second group of methods includes using a hypothesis testing [10] and penalized methods [19, 20, 22]. A number of authors have also analyzed regularized estimation of the covariance matrix [3, 4, 18, 25, 27].

The most relevant work in the literature related to this paper is the estimation of time-varying Gaussian graphical models considered in [29], where the authors assume that the observations $\mathbf{x}^t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma^t)$ are independent, but not identically distributed, realizations of a multivariate Gaussian distribution whose covariance matrix varies with time. This model represents a counterpart in the continuous domain of our model defined in Eq. (1). The problem of consistent, in the Frobenius norm, estimation of covariance and concentration matrix is addressed under the assumption that the concentration matrix is sparse and that the covariance matrix varies smoothly with time. Note, however, that the problem of consistent estimation of the non-zero patterns in the concentration matrix is not addressed there. In [29], the estimator $\hat{\Sigma}^T$ of the covariance matrix Σ^T is obtained by maximizing the log-likelihood of the data defined by a nonparametric estimate of the sample covariance matrix. However, this maximum likelihood approach does not carry over to the case of discrete MRFs concerned in this paper due to intractability of evaluation of the log-partition function.

In the case of discrete MRFs, direct maximization of the log-likelihood is not tractable. When the structure of the graph is assumed to be invariant, [21] use a surrogate function which decomposes across different nodes and as a result can be maximized efficiently. It can be shown that the resulting estimator can consistently recover the static graph structure. Our method can be thought of as a nonparametric extension to the approach in [21], which allows for graph structure to change over time. Other work on graph structure estimation in discrete MRFs include score based searches [7, 24], which are limited to restricted classes of graphs due to the combinatorial explosion of the search space of graphs [6], minimizing the Kullback-Leibler divergence [1] and other pseudo-likelihood methods [5, 9].

1.3. Highlights of This Paper. We first propose an algorithmic strategy which can be understood as a nonparametric extension of the method developed in [21]. The time-varying graph estimation problem is decomposed into a sequence of neighborhood estimation problems, one for each node, at every time point in question. We formulate the time-specific neighborhood estimation as a penalized convex optimization problem, which can be efficiently solved. Running the estimation procedure for each node and combining the estimates gives the resulting estimate of the overall graph structure at a time point. The decomposition of the graph structure estimation into the sequence of neighborhood estimation problems has previously been successfully used in [19, 21].

To estimate the neighborhood of each node at an arbitrary time point of interest, we express the conditional log-likelihood of each node given the rest of nodes in the graph as a generalized time-varying coefficient model [13], and maximize the ℓ_1 penalized conditional log-likelihood. Using a kernel to reweigh samples from different time points with respect to the time point in question, we approximate all the time-varying coefficient functions locally by a constant coefficient function pertaining to the time point for which the graph is being estimated, and the ℓ_1 penalty is introduced to perform model selection by shrinking the estimates towards zero and creating sparse estimates, which corresponds to estimated neighborhoods with few edges. The immediate benefit of this approach is that we can readily use the existing fast algorithms for the ℓ_1 penalized methods. Details of this algorithm are given in Section 2.

The main contribution of the paper is to provide theoretical guarantees of the proposed estimation procedure. In particular, we establish conditions under which the procedure is able to recover the underlying time-varying graph structure consistently. We show that the following two conditions are

sufficient for the graph recovery: the first one guarantees that the coefficient functions change smoothly over time so that they can be approximated well locally with a constant; the second one guarantees that we can reliably separate the non-zero coefficients from the zero coefficients. We analyze the case where the number of observations is smaller than the number of parameters in the model, but the number of true relevant parameters is small, i.e., the graph structure is sparse. The conditions and the main theorem are given in Section 3. To establish the main theorem, we will need to show that the sample Fisher information matrix is concentrated around the true Fisher information matrix associated with the conditional likelihood model for each node at the time point of interest. In Section 4 we state technical lemmas that establish these results, while the proofs are deferred to the appendix. Note that the results on the sample Fisher information matrix do not follow from the similar results given in [21] due to the non-*i.i.d.* nature of the samples. Section 5 is devoted to the proof of the main theorem. Concluding remarks are given in Section 6.

2. Estimation Procedure. Let $\mathcal{D}_n = \{\mathbf{x}^t \sim \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^t} | t \in \mathcal{T}_n\}$ be a sample of n data points, which are sampled independently from $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^t}$ at discrete time steps indexed by $\mathcal{T}_n$, where $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^t}$ is given in Eq. (1). The problem is to estimate the graph structure of the Markov random field associated with the distribution $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^\tau}$ at any given time point $\tau \in [0, 1]$. We consider the parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}^\tau$ as a $\binom{p}{2}$ -dimensional vector, indexed by distinct pairs of nodes, of which an element is non-zero if and only if the corresponding edge $(u, v) \in E^\tau$. The problem of recovering the structure of the graph G^τ is now equivalent to estimating the non-zero pattern of the vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}^\tau$, i.e., locations of non-zero elements of $\boldsymbol{\theta}^\tau$. A stronger notion of structure estimation is that of *signed edge recovery*; for a given graphical model G^τ with parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}^\tau$, we define the signed edge vector $SE^\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{\binom{p}{2}}$ as:

$$(2) \quad SE^\tau = \begin{cases} \text{sign}(\theta_{uv}^\tau) & \text{if } (u, v) \in E^\tau \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The classical problem of graph recovery can be seen as recovering the vector $|SE^\tau|$ of absolute values. The procedure we give next estimates the signed edge vector.

Let $\tau \in [0, 1]$ be any given time point for which we are interested in estimating the structure of the graph G^τ from the sample $\mathcal{D}_n$. Note that in order to get insight into the dynamics of the graph changes, one needs to estimate the graph G^τ at multiple values of τ . Typically, in a real application task, one is interested in estimating G^τ for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_n$. The estimation

procedure for one value of τ is based on the recovery of the neighborhood of each node at that time based on all data points in $\mathcal{D}_n$. It is simple to observe that recovering the signed edge vector SE^τ of a graph G^τ is equivalent to recovering, for each vertex $u \in V$, the set of neighboring edges $S^\tau(u) = \{(u, v) : (u, v) \in E^\tau\}$ and the correct signs $\text{sign}(\theta_{uv}^\tau)$ for all $(u, v) \in S^\tau(u)$. We define the set of *signed neighboring edges* as

$$S_\pm^\tau(u) := \{(\text{sign}(\theta_{uv}^\tau), (u, v)) : (u, v) \in S^\tau(u)\}.$$

The set of signed neighboring edges $S_\pm^\tau(u)$ can be determined from the signs of elements of the $(p-1)$ -dimensional subvector of parameters

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau := \{\theta_{uv}^\tau : v \in V \setminus u\}$$

associated with vertex u . Under the model (1), the conditional distribution of X_u^τ given other variables $\mathbf{X}_{\setminus u}^\tau := \{X_v^\tau : v \in V \setminus u\}$ takes the form

$$(3) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau}(x_u^\tau | \mathbf{X}_{\setminus u}^\tau = \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^\tau) = \frac{\exp(2x_u^\tau \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^\tau \rangle)}{\exp(2x_u^\tau \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^\tau \rangle) + 1},$$

where $\langle a, b \rangle = a'b$ denotes the dot product. For simplicity, we will write $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau}(x_u^\tau | \mathbf{X}_{\setminus u}^\tau = \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^\tau)$ as $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau}(x_u^\tau | \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^\tau)$. Observe that the model given in (3) can be viewed as expressing X_u^τ as the response variable in the generalized varying-coefficient models with $\mathbf{X}_{\setminus u}^\tau$ playing the role of covariates.

Under the model given in Eq. (3) the log-likelihood, for one data-point $t \in \mathcal{T}_n$, can be written in the following form:

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u; \mathbf{x}^t) &= \log \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_u}(x_u^t | \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t) \\ &= x_u^t \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_u, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \rangle - \log \left(\exp(\langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_u, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \rangle) + \exp(-\langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_u, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \rangle) \right). \end{aligned}$$

For an arbitrary point of interest $\tau \in [0, 1]$, we define our estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau$ of the sign-pattern of the vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau$ as the solution to the following convex program:

$$(5) \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau = \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_u \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}} \{ \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u; \mathcal{D}_n) + \lambda_n \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_u\|_1 \}$$

where

$$(6) \quad \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u; \mathcal{D}_n) = - \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u; \mathbf{x}^t)$$

is the weighted logloss, with weights defined as

$$w_t^\tau = \frac{K_h(t - \tau)}{\sum_{t' \in \mathcal{T}_n} K_h(t' - \tau)}$$

Algorithm 1 Graph structure estimation

Input: Dataset $\mathcal{D}_n$, time point of interest $\tau \in [0, 1]$, penalty parameter λ_n , bandwidth parameter h

Output: Estimate of the graph structure $\hat{G}^\tau$

- 1: **for all** $u \in V$ **do**
 - 2: Estimate $\hat{\theta}_u$ by solving the convex program (5)
 - 3: Estimate the set of signed neighboring edges $\hat{S}_\pm^\tau(u)$ using (7)
 - 4: **end for**
 - 5: Combine sets $\{\hat{S}_\pm^\tau(u)\}_{u \in V}$ to obtain $\hat{G}^\tau$.
-

and $K_h(\cdot) = K(\cdot/h)$ is a symmetric nonnegative kernel. Note that in the objective given in (5) we approximate the function $\theta_u^t : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$ around the point τ with a constant $\hat{\theta}_u^\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$. The regularization parameter $\lambda_n \geq 0$ is specified by a user and controls the sparsity of the solution. The program (5) is convex, but not differentiable, because of the ℓ_1 norm. The minimum over θ_u is always achieved, as the problem can be cast as a constrained optimization problem over the ball $\|\theta_u\|_1 \leq C(\lambda_n)$ and the claim follows from the Weierstrass theorem.

Let $\hat{\theta}_u^\tau$ be a minimizer of (5). The convex program (5) does not necessarily have a unique optimum, but as we will prove shortly, in the regime of interest any two solutions will have non-zero elements in the same positions. Based on the vector $\hat{\theta}_u^\tau$, we construct the estimate of the signed neighborhood:

$$(7) \quad \hat{S}_\pm^\tau(u) := \left\{ (\text{sign}(\hat{\theta}_{uv}^\tau), (u, v)) : v \in V \setminus u, \hat{\theta}_{uv}^\tau \neq 0 \right\}.$$

The structure of graph G^τ is consistently estimated if every signed neighborhood is recovered, i.e. $\hat{S}_\pm^\tau(u) = S_\pm^\tau(u)$ for all $u \in V$. A summary of the algorithm is given in Algorithm 1.

The convex program (5), can be solved using any general optimization solver. One particularly fast algorithm, based on the coordinate-wise descent method, for this type of a problem is described in [15] and implemented as the R package *glmnet*.

3. Main theoretical result. In this section, we describe the properties of Algorithm 1. We give the conditions under which the estimation procedure estimates the unknown graph structure consistently. Using notation from the last section, we give conditions under which the estimator $\widehat{SE}_n^\tau$ satisfies the following

$$\mathbb{P}[\widehat{SE}_n^\tau = SE^\tau] \rightarrow 1, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

This property is known as *sparsistency*. We will mainly be interested in the high-dimensional case, where the dimension $p = p_n$ is comparable or even

larger than the sample size n . It is of great interest to understand the performance of the estimator under this assumption, since in many real world scenarios the dimensionality of data is large. Our analysis is asymptotic and we consider the model dimension $p = p_n$ to grow at a certain rate as the sample size grows. This essentially allows us to consider more “complicated” models as we observe more data points. Another quantity that will describe the complexity of the model is the maximum node degree $s = s_n$, which is also considered as a function of the sample size. The main result describes the scaling of the triple (n, p_n, s_n) under which the estimation procedure given in the previous section estimates the graph structure consistently.

Since our main interest is in estimating the structure of a high-dimensional graph from a small size sample, we assume that the true structure of the graph is sparse, i.e., we assume that each node has a small number of adjacent edges. The ℓ_1 regularization procedures have been proved very successful as model selection techniques in a variety of problems, and, as we show here, our method is successful in estimating the time-varying graph structure.

In order to estimate the non-zero pattern of the vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau$ for each node $u \in V$ we need to impose regularity conditions on the covariates in the model (3). We express these conditions in terms of the Hessian of the log-likelihood function as evaluated at the true model parameter, i.e., the Fisher information matrix. The Fisher information matrix $\mathbf{Q}_u^\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{(p-1) \times (p-1)}$ is a matrix defined for each node $u \in V$ as:

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}_u^\tau &:= \mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 \log \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau}[X_u | \mathbf{X}_{\setminus u}]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\eta(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau) \mathbf{X}_{\setminus u} \mathbf{X}_{\setminus u}'], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\eta(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u) := \frac{4 \exp(2x_u \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_u, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u} \rangle)}{(\exp(2x_u \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_u, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u} \rangle) + 1)^2}$$

is the variance function. We write $\mathbf{Q}^\tau := \mathbf{Q}_u^\tau$ and assume that the following assumptions hold for each node $u \in V$.

A1: Dependency condition There exist constants $C_{\min}, D_{\min}, D_{\max} > 0$ such that

$$\Lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau) \geq C_{\min}$$

and

$$\Lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^\tau) \geq D_{\min}, \quad \Lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^\tau) \leq D_{\max},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^\tau = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^\tau}[\mathbf{X}^\tau \mathbf{X}^{\tau'}]$. Here $\Lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ and $\Lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ denote the minimum and maximum eigenvalue of a matrix.

A2: Incoherence condition There exists an incoherence parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{Q}_{S^c S}^\tau (\mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1}\|_\infty \leq 1 - \alpha,$$

where, for a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{a \times b}$, the ℓ_∞ matrix norm is defined as $\|A\|_\infty := \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, a\}} \sum_{j=1}^b |a_{ij}|$.

With some abuse of notation, when defining assumptions A1 and A2, we use the index set $S := S^\tau(u)$ to denote nodes adjacent to the node u at time τ . For example, if $s = |S|$, then $\mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times s}$ denotes the sub-matrix of $\mathbf{Q}^\tau$ indexed by S .

As in the structure estimation of the invariant MRF from an *i.i.d.* sample [21], the Fisher information matrix $\mathbf{Q}^\tau$, associated with the local conditional probability, plays very important role in determining success of the method. It can also be regarded as a counterpart of the covariance matrix $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\tau \mathbf{X}^{\tau'}]$ of Gaussian graphical models. Note that the conditions A1 and A2 are symbolically the same as for the *i.i.d.* case, when the graph is invariant over time [21], with the difference that we assume that the conditions hold for the time point of interest τ at which we want to recover the graph structure. Condition A1 assures that the relevant features are not too correlated. Condition A2 assures that the irrelevant features do not have to strong effect onto the relevant features. Similar type of condition has been proposed also in the case of the linear regression (e.g. [19]).

Next, we assume that the distribution $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^t}$ changes smoothly over time, which we express in the following form, for every node $u \in V$.

A3: Smoothness conditions Let $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^t = [\sigma_{uv}^t]$. There exists a constant $M > 0$ such that it upper bounds the following quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{u,v \in V \times V} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \sigma_{uv}^t \right| &< M, & \max_{u,v \in V \times V} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \sigma_{uv}^t \right| &< M \\ \max_{u,v \in V \times V} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \theta_{uv}^t \right| &< M, & \max_{u,v \in V \times V} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \theta_{uv}^t \right| &< M. \end{aligned}$$

The condition A3 captures our notion of the distribution that changes smoothly over time. If we consider the elements of the covariance matrix and the elements of the parameter vector as a function of time, then these functions have bounded first and second derivatives. From these assumptions, it is not too hard to see that elements of the Fisher information matrix are also smooth functions of time.

A4: Kernel The kernel $K : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a symmetric function, supported in $[-1, 1]$, and there exists a constant $M_K \geq 1$ which upper bounds the quantities $\max_{z \in \mathbb{R}} |K(z)|$ and $\max_{z \in \mathbb{R}} K(z)^2$.

This condition, A4, gives some regularity conditions on the kernel used to define the weights. For example, the assumption is satisfied by the box kernel $K(z) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{I}\{z \in [-1, 1]\}$. Under the assumption A4, the kernel has the following properties:

$$2 \int_{-1}^0 z K(z) dz \leq 2 \int_{-1}^0 K(z) dz = 1$$

$$2 \int_{-1}^0 z^2 K(z) dz \leq 1.$$

With the assumptions made above, we are ready to state the theorem that characterizes the consistency of the method given in Section 2 for recovering the unknown time-varying graph structure. An important quantity, appearing in the statement, is the minimum value of the parameter vector that is different from zero

$$\theta_{\min} = \min_{(u,v) \in E^\tau} |\theta_{uv}^\tau|.$$

Intuitively, the success of the recovery should depend on how hard it is to distinguish the true non-zero parameters from noise.

THEOREM 1. *Assume that the dependency condition A1 holds with $C_{\min}$, $D_{\min}$ and $D_{\max}$, that for each node $u \in V$, the Fisher information matrix $\mathbf{Q}^\tau$ satisfies the incoherence condition A2 with parameter α , the smoothness assumption A3 holds with parameter M , and that the kernel function used in Algorithm 1 satisfies assumption A4 with parameter M_K . Let the regularization parameter satisfy*

$$\lambda_n \geq C \frac{\sqrt{\log p}}{n^{1/3}}$$

for a constant $C > 0$ independent of (n, p, s) . Furthermore, assume that the following conditions hold:

1. $h = \mathcal{O}(n^{-\frac{1}{3}})$
2. $s = o(n^{1/3})$, $\frac{s^3 \log p}{n^{2/3}} = o(1)$
3. $\theta_{\min} = \Omega(\frac{\sqrt{s \log p}}{n^{1/3}})$.

Then for any $\tau \in [0, 1]$, and in particular for $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_n$, the estimated graph $\hat{G}^\tau(\lambda_n)$ obtained through neighborhood selection satisfies

$$(9) \quad \mathbb{P} \left[\hat{G}^\tau(\lambda_n) \neq G^\tau \right] = \mathcal{O} \left(\exp \left(-C \frac{n^{2/3}}{s^3} + C' \log p \right) \right) \rightarrow 0,$$

for some constants C', C'' independent of (n, p, s) .

This theorem guarantees that the procedure in Algorithm 1 asymptotically recovers the sequence of graphs underlying all the nodal-state measurements in a time series, and the snapshot of the evolving graph at any time point during measurement intervals, under appropriate regularization parameter λ_n as long as the ambient dimensionality p and the maximum node degree s are not too large, and minimum θ values do not tend to zero too fast. This is a somewhat surprising result because it suggests that structure recovery is possible when only one sample or even no sample exactly corresponding to the structure is available. The key insight behind this possibility is the smoothness assumption on graph evolution, which allows data points at, in theory, any time point (but in practice nearby time points determined by the kernel bandwidth) to contribute to the estimation of a graph at a particular time of interest.

Remarks:

1. The bandwidth parameter h is chosen so that it balances variance and squared bias of estimation of the elements of the Fisher information matrix.
2. Condition 2 requires that the size of the neighborhood of each node remains smaller than the size of the samples. However, the model ambient dimension p is allowed to grow exponentially in n .
3. Condition 3 is crucial to be able to distinguish true elements in the neighborhood of a node. We require that the size of the minimum element of the parameter vector stays bounded away from zero.
4. The rate of convergence is dictated by the rate of convergence of the sample Fisher information matrix to the true Fisher information matrix, as shown in Lemma 6. Using a local linear smoother, instead of the kernel smoother, to estimate the coefficients in the model (3) one could get a faster rate of convergence.

In the sequel, we set out to prove Theorem 1. The plan is to first show that the empirical estimates of the Fisher information matrix and the covariance matrix are close elementwise to their population versions. Next, we show that the minimizer $\hat{\theta}_u^\tau$ of (5) is unique under the assumptions given in Theorem 1. Finally, we show that with high probability the estimator $\hat{\theta}_u^\tau$ recovers the true neighborhood of a node u . Repeating the procedure for all nodes $u \in V$ we obtain the result stated in Theorem 1.

4. Large deviation inequalities. In this section we characterize the deviation of elements of the sample Fisher information matrix $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}^\tau := \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_u^\tau$ at

time point τ , defined as

$$(10) \quad \hat{\mathbf{Q}}^\tau = \sum_t w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau) \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^{t'}$$

and the sample covariance matrix $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^\tau$ from their population versions $\mathbf{Q}^\tau$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^\tau$. As will be seen later, in the proof of the main theorem, consistency result crucially depends on the bounds on the difference $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}^\tau - \mathbf{Q}^\tau$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^\tau - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^\tau$. In the following, we use C, C' and C'' as generic positive constants independent of (n, p, s) .

4.1. *Sample Fisher information matrix.* To bound the deviation between elements of $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}^\tau = [\hat{q}_{vv'}^\tau]$ and $\mathbf{Q}^\tau = [q_{vv'}^\tau]$, $v, v' \in V \setminus u$, we will use the following decomposition:

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} |\hat{q}_{vv'}^\tau - q_{vv'}^\tau| &\leq \left| \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau) x_v^t x_{v'}^t - \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t) x_v^t x_{v'}^t \right| \\ &+ \left| \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t) x_v^t x_{v'}^t - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t) x_v^t x_{v'}^t \right] \right| \\ &+ \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t) x_v^t x_{v'}^t \right] - q_{vv'}^\tau \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma gives us bounds on the terms in Eq. (11).

LEMMA 2. *Assume that the smoothness condition A3 is satisfied and that the kernel function $K(\cdot)$ satisfies A4. Furthermore, assume*

$$\max_{t \in [0,1]} |\{v \in \{1, \dots, p\} : \theta_{uv}^t \neq 0\}| < s,$$

i.e., the number of non-zero elements of the parameter vector is bounded by s . There exist constants $C, C', C'' > 0$, depending on M and M_K only, which are the constants quantifying assumption A3 and A4, respectively, such that for any $\tau \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$(12) \quad \max_{v, v'} \left| \hat{q}_{vv'}^\tau - \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t) x_v^t x_{v'}^t \right| = Csh$$

$$(13) \quad \max_{v, v'} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t) x_v^t x_{v'}^t \right] - q_{vv'}^\tau \right| = C'h.$$

Furthermore,

$$(14) \quad \left| \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} (w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t) x_v^t x_{v'}^t - \mathbb{E}[w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t) X_v^t X_{v'}^t]) \right| < \epsilon$$

with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-C''nh\epsilon^2)$.

Using results of Lemma 2 we can obtain the rate at which the element-wise distance between the true and sample Fisher information matrix decays to zero as a function of the bandwidth parameter h and the size of neighborhood s . In the proof of the main theorem, the bandwidth parameter will be chosen so that the bias and variance terms are balanced.

4.2. *Sample covariance matrix.* The deviation of the elements of the sample covariance matrix is bounded in a similar way as the deviation of elements of the sample Fisher information matrix, given in Lemma 2. Denoting the sample covariance matrix at time point τ as

$$(15) \quad \hat{\Sigma}^\tau = \sum_t w_t^\tau \mathbf{x}^t \mathbf{x}^{t'},$$

and the difference between the elements of $\hat{\Sigma}^\tau$ and Σ^τ can be bounded as

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned} |\hat{\sigma}_{uv}^\tau - \sigma_{uv}^\tau| &= \left| \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau x_u^t x_v^t - \sigma_{uv}^\tau \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau x_u^t x_v^t - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau x_u^t x_v^t \right] \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau x_u^t x_v^t \right] - \sigma_{uv}^\tau \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma gives us bounds on the terms in Eq. (16).

LEMMA 3. *Assume that the smoothness condition A3 is satisfied and that the kernel function $K(\cdot)$ satisfies A4. There are constants $C, C' > 0$ depending on M and M_K only such that for any $\tau \in [0, 1]$, we have*

$$(17) \quad \max_{u,v} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau x_u^t x_v^t \right] - \sigma_{uv}^\tau \right| \leq Ch.$$

and

$$(18) \quad \left| \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau x_u^t x_v^t - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau x_u^t x_v^t \right] \right| \leq \epsilon$$

with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-C' n h \epsilon^2)$.

A similar result was established in [29] for the case where $\mathbf{x}$ is a multi-variate Normal distributed random variable.

5. Proof of the main result. In this section we give the proof of Theorem 1. The proof is given through a sequence of technical lemmas. Note that in what follows, we use C, C' and C'' to denote positive constants independent of (n, p, s) and their value may change from line to line.

The main idea behind the proof is to characterize the minimum obtained in Eq. (5) and show that the correct neighborhood of one node at an arbitrary time point can be recovered with high probability. Next, using the union bound over the nodes of a graph, we can conclude that the whole graph is estimated sparsistently at the time points of interest.

We first address the problem of uniqueness of the solution to (5). Note that because the objective in Eq. (5) is not strictly convex it is necessary to show that the non-zero pattern of the parameter vector is unique, since otherwise the problem of sparsistent graph estimation would be meaningless. Under the conditions of Theorem 1 we also have that the solution is unique, which we prove in two steps.

Let us denote the set of all solution to (5) as $\Theta(\lambda_n)$. We define the objective function in Eq. (5) by

$$(19) \quad F(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u) := - \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u; \mathbf{x}^t) + \lambda_n \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_u\|_1$$

and we say that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_u \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$ satisfies the system $(\mathcal{S})$ when

$$(20) \quad \forall v = 1, \dots, p-1, \begin{cases} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau (\nabla \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u; \mathbf{x}^t))_v = \lambda_n \text{sign}(\theta_{uv}) & \text{if } \theta_{uv} \neq 0 \\ |\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau (\nabla \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u; \mathbf{x}^t))_v| \leq \lambda_n & \text{if } \theta_{uv} = 0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$(21) \quad \nabla \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u; \mathbf{x}^t) = \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \left\{ x_u^t + 1 - 2\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_u}[x_u^t = 1 | \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t] \right\}$$

is the score function. Eq. (20) is obtained by taking the sub-gradient of $F(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and equating it to zero. From the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions it follows that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_u \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$ belongs to $\Theta(\lambda_n)$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{\theta}_u$ satisfies the system $(\mathcal{S})$. The following Lemma shows that any two solutions have the same non-zero pattern.

LEMMA 4. *Consider a node $u \in V$. If $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$ both belong to $\Theta(\lambda_n)$ then $\langle \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t, \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u \rangle = \langle \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u \rangle$, $t \in \mathcal{T}_n$. Furthermore, solutions $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u$ have non-zero elements in the same positions.*

We now use the result of Lemma 4 to show that with high probability the minimizer in (5) is unique. We consider the following event:

$$\Omega_{01} = \{D_{\min} - \delta \leq \mathbf{y}' \hat{\Sigma}_{SS}^\tau \mathbf{y} \leq D_{\max} + \delta : \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^s, \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 = 1\}.$$

LEMMA 5. Consider a node $u \in V$. Assume that the conditions of Lemma 3 are satisfied. Assume also that the dependency condition A1 holds. There are constants $C, C', C'' > 0$ depending on M and M_K only, such that

$$\mathbb{P}[\Omega_{01}] \geq 1 - 4 \exp(-Cnh(\frac{\delta}{s} - C'h)^2 + C'' \log(s)).$$

Moreover, on the event Ω_{01} , the minimizer of (5) is unique.

We have shown that the estimate $\hat{\theta}_u^\tau$ is unique on the event Ω_{01} , which under the conditions of Theorem 1 happens with probability converging to 1 exponentially fast. To finish the proof of Theorem 1 we need to show that the estimate $\hat{\theta}_u^\tau$ has the same non-zero pattern as the true parameter vector θ_u^τ . In order to show that we consider a few “good” events, which happen with high probability and on which the estimate $\hat{\theta}_u^\tau$ has the desired properties. We start by characterizing the sample version of the Fisher information matrix, defined in Eq. (10). Consider the following events:

$$\Omega_{02} := \{C_{\min} - \delta \leq \mathbf{y}' \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau \mathbf{y} : \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^s, \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 = 1\}$$

and

$$\Omega_{03} := \{\|\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{S^c S}^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1}\|_\infty \leq 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\}.$$

LEMMA 6. Assume that the conditions of Lemma 3 are satisfied. Assume also that the dependency condition A1 holds and the incoherence condition A2 holds with the incoherence parameter α . There are constants $C, C', C'' > 0$ depending on M, M_K and α only, such that

$$\mathbb{P}[\Omega_{02}] \geq 1 - 2 \exp(-C \frac{nh\delta^2}{s^2} + C' \log(s))$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}[\Omega_{03}] \geq 1 - \exp(-C \frac{nh}{s^3} + C'' \log(p)).$$

Lemma 6 guarantees that the sample Fisher information matrix satisfies “good” properties with high probability, under the appropriate scaling of quantities n, p, s and h . A similar result was obtained for the sample Fisher information matrix in [21] for the model that does not change with time. Note that the result in Lemma 6 is somewhat harder to obtain since it heavily relies on the results of Lemma 2.

We are now ready to analyze the optimum to the convex program (5). To that end we apply the mean-value theorem coordinate-wise to the gradient

of the weighted logloss $\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \nabla \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u; \mathbf{x}^t)$ and obtain

$$(22) \quad \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau (\nabla \gamma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t) - \nabla \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t)) = [\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \nabla^2 \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t)](\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau) + \boldsymbol{\Delta}^\tau,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Delta}^\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$ is the remainder term of the form

$$(23) \quad \Delta_v^\tau = [\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau (\nabla^2 \gamma(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^{(v)}; \mathbf{x}^t) - \nabla^2 \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t))]'_v (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau)$$

and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^{(v)}$ is a point on the line between $\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau$, and $[\cdot]'_v$ denoting the v -th row of the matrix. Recall that $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}^\tau = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \nabla^2 \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t)$. Using the expansion (22), we write the KKT conditions given in Eq. (20) in the following form, $\forall v = 1, \dots, p-1$,

$$(24) \quad \begin{cases} \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_v^\tau (\boldsymbol{\theta}_u - \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau) + \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau (\nabla \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t))_v + \Delta_v^\tau = \lambda_n \text{sign}(\theta_{uv}) & \text{if } \theta_{uv} \neq 0 \\ |\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_v^\tau (\boldsymbol{\theta}_u - \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau) + \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau (\nabla \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t))_v + \Delta_v^\tau| \leq \lambda_n & \text{if } \theta_{uv} = 0. \end{cases}$$

We consider the following events

$$\Omega_0 = \Omega_{01} \cap \Omega_{02} \cap \Omega_{03},$$

$$\Omega_1 = \{\forall v \in S : |\lambda_n((\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \text{sign}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau))_v - ((\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \mathbf{W}_S^\tau)_v| < |\theta_{uv}^\tau|\}$$

and

$$\Omega_2 = \{\forall v \in S^c : |(\mathbf{W}_{S^c}^\tau - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{S^c S}^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \mathbf{W}_S^\tau)_v| < \frac{\alpha}{2} \lambda_n\}$$

where

$$\mathbf{W}^\tau = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \nabla \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t) + \boldsymbol{\Delta}^\tau.$$

We will work on the event Ω_0 on which the minimum eigenvalue of $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau$ is strictly positive and, so, $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau$ is regular and $\Omega_0 \cap \Omega_1$ and $\Omega_0 \cap \Omega_2$ are well defined.

PROPOSITION 7. *Assume that the conditions of Lemma 6 are satisfied. The event*

$$\{\forall \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1} \text{ solution of } (\mathcal{S}), \text{ we have } \text{sign}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau) = \text{sign}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau)\} \cap \Omega_0$$

contains event $\Omega_0 \cap \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2$.

PROOF. We consider the following linear functional

$$G : \begin{cases} \mathbb{R}^s & \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^s \\ \boldsymbol{\theta} & \mapsto \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau + (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \mathbf{W}_S^\tau - \lambda_n (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \text{sign}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau). \end{cases}$$

For any two vectors $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_s)' \in \mathbb{R}^s$ and $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_s)' \in \mathbb{R}_+^s$, define the following set centered at $\mathbf{y}$ as

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{r}) = \prod_{i=1}^s (y_i - r_i, y_i + r_i).$$

Now, we have

$$G(\mathcal{B}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau, |\boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau|)) = \mathcal{B}\left((\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \mathbf{W}_S^\tau - \lambda_n (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \text{sign}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau), |\boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau|\right).$$

On the event $\Omega_0 \cap \Omega_1$,

$$0 \in \mathcal{B}\left((\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \mathbf{W}_S^\tau - \lambda_n (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \text{sign}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau), |\boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau|\right),$$

which implies that there exists a vector $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_S^\tau \in \mathcal{B}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau, |\boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau|)$ such that $G(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_S^\tau) = 0$. For $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_S^\tau$ it holds that $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_S^\tau = \boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau + \lambda_n (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \text{sign}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau) - (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \mathbf{W}_S^\tau$ and $|\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_S^\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau| < |\boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau|$. Thus, the vector $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_S^\tau$ satisfies

$$\text{sign}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_S^\tau) = \text{sign}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau)$$

and

$$(25) \quad \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_S^\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau) + \mathbf{W}_S^\tau = \lambda_n \text{sign}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_S^\tau).$$

Next, we consider the vector $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^\tau = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_S^\tau \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S^c}^\tau \end{pmatrix}$ where $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S^c}^\tau$ is the null vector of $\mathbb{R}^{p-1-s}$. On event Ω_0 , from Lemma 6 we know that $\|\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{S^c S}^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1}\|_\infty \leq 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}$. Now, on the event $\Omega_0 \cap \Omega_2$ it holds

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{S^c S}^\tau (\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_S^\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau) + \mathbf{W}_{S^c}^\tau\|_\infty = \\ & \|-\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{S^c S}^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \mathbf{W}_S^\tau + \mathbf{W}_{S^c}^\tau + \lambda_n \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{S^c S}^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \text{sign}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_S^\tau)\|_\infty < \lambda_n. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^\tau$, equations (25) and (26) are equivalent to saying that $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^\tau$ satisfies conditions (24) or (20), i.e., saying that $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^\tau$ satisfies the KKT conditions. Since $\text{sign}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_S^\tau) = \text{sign}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau)$, we have $\text{sign}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^\tau) = \text{sign}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau)$. Furthermore, because of the uniqueness of the solution to (5) on the event Ω_0 , we conclude that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau = \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^\tau$. $\square$

Proposition 7 implies Theorem 1 if we manage to show that the event $\Omega_0 \cap \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2$ occurs with high probability under the assumptions stated in Theorem 1. Proposition 8 characterizes the probability of that event, which concludes the proof of Theorem 1.

PROPOSITION 8. *Assume that the conditions of Theorem 1 are satisfied. Then there are constants $C, C' > 0$ depending on $M, M_K, D_{\max}, C_{\min}$ and α only, such that the following holds:*

$$(27) \quad \mathbb{P}[\Omega_0 \cap \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2] \geq 1 - 2 \exp(-Cnh(\lambda_n - sh)^2 + \log(p)).$$

PROOF. We start the proof of the proposition by giving a technical lemma, which characterizes the distance between vectors $\hat{\theta}_u^\tau = \bar{\theta}^\tau$ and θ_u^τ under the assumptions of Theorem 1, where $\bar{\theta}^\tau$ is constructed in the proof of Proposition 7. The following lemma gives a bound on the distance between the vectors $\hat{\theta}_S^\tau$ and θ_S^τ , which we use in the proof of the proposition. The proof of the lemma is given in Appendix.

LEMMA 9. *Assume that the conditions of Theorem 1 are satisfied. There are constants $C, C' > 0$ depending on $M, M_K, D_{\max}, C_{\min}$ and α only, such that*

$$(28) \quad \|\hat{\theta}_S^\tau - \theta_S^\tau\|_2 \leq C \frac{\sqrt{s \log p}}{n^{1/3}}$$

with probability at least $1 - \exp(-C' \log p)$.

Using Lemma 9 we can prove Proposition 8. We start by studying the probability of the event Ω_2 . We have

$$\Omega_2^C \subset \cup_{v \in S^c} \{\mathbf{W}_v + (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{S^c S}^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \mathbf{W}_S^\tau)_v \geq \frac{\alpha}{2} \lambda_n\}.$$

Recall that $\mathbf{W}^\tau = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \nabla \gamma(\theta_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t) + \Delta^\tau$. Let us define the event

$$\Omega_3 = \left\{ \max_{1 \leq v \leq p-1} |\mathbf{e}'_v \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \nabla \gamma(\theta_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t)| < \frac{\alpha \lambda_n}{4(2 - \alpha)} \right\},$$

where $\mathbf{e}_v \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$ is a unit vector with one at the position v and zeros elsewhere. From the proof of Lemma 9 available in the appendix we have that $\mathbb{P}[\Omega_3] \geq 1 - 2 \exp(-C \log(p))$ and on that event the bound given in Eq. (28) holds.

On the event Ω_3 , we bound the remainder term Δ^τ . Let $g : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be defined as $g(z) = \frac{4\exp(2z)}{(1+\exp(2z))^2}$. Then $\eta(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u) = g(x_u \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_u, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u} \rangle)$. For $v \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$, using the mean value theorem it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_v &= \left[\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau (\nabla^2 \gamma(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^{(v)}; \mathbf{x}^t) - \nabla^2 \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t))' \right]_v (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau) \\ &= \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau [\eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^{(v)}) - \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau)] [\mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^{t'}]_v' [\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau] \\ &= \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau g'(x_u \langle \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^{(v)}, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \rangle) [x_u^t \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t]_v' [\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^{(v)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau] [x_v^t \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^{t'}] [\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau] \\ &= \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \{g'(x_u \langle \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^{(v)}, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \rangle) x_u^t x_v^t\} \{[\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^{(v)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau]' \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^{t'} [\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau]\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^{(v)}$ is another point on the line joining $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau$. A simple calculation shows that $|g'(x_u \langle \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^{(v)}, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \rangle) x_u^t x_v^t| \leq 1$, for all $t \in \mathcal{T}_n$, so we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta_v| &\leq [\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^{(v)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau]' \left\{ \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^{t'} \right\} [\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau] \\ &\leq [\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau]' \left\{ \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^{t'} \right\} [\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau] \\ (29) \quad &= [\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_S^\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau]' \left\{ \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \mathbf{x}_S^t \mathbf{x}_S^{t'} \right\} [\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_S^\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau] \\ &\leq D_{\max} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_S^\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the equations (29) and (28), we have that on the event Ω_3

$$\max_{1 \leq v \leq p-1} |\Delta_v| \leq C \lambda_n^2 s < \frac{\lambda_n \alpha}{4(2-\alpha)}$$

where C is a constant depending on $D_{\max}$ and $C_{\min}$ only.

On the event $\Omega_0 \cap \Omega_3$, we have

$$W_v^\tau + (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{S^c S}^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \mathbf{W}_S^\tau)_v < \frac{\alpha \lambda_n}{2(2-\alpha)} + (1-\alpha) \frac{\alpha \lambda_n}{2(2-\alpha)} \leq \frac{\alpha \lambda_n}{2}$$

and we can conclude that $\mathbb{P}[\Omega_2] \geq 1 - 2\exp(-C \log(p))$ for some constant C depending on $M, M_K, C_{\min}, D_{\max}$ and α only.

Next, we study the probability of the event Ω_1 . We have

$$(30) \quad \Omega_1^C \subset \cup_{v \in S} \{\lambda_n ((\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \text{sign}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau))_v + ((\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \mathbf{W}_S^\tau)_v \geq \theta_{uv}^\tau\}.$$

Again, we will consider the event Ω_3 . On the event $\Omega_0 \cap \Omega_3$ we have that

$$(31) \quad \lambda_n ((\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \text{sign}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_S^\tau))_v + ((\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \mathbf{W}_S^\tau)_v \leq \frac{\lambda_n \sqrt{s}}{C_{\min}} + \frac{\lambda_n}{2C_{\min}} \leq C \lambda_n \sqrt{s},$$

for some constant C . When $\theta_{\min} > C\lambda_n\sqrt{s}$, we have that $\mathbb{P}[\Omega_1] \geq 1 - 2\exp(-C\log(p))$ for some constant C that depends on $M, M_K, C_{\min}, D_{\max}$ and α only. $\square$

In summary, under the assumptions of Theorem 1, the probability of event $\Omega_0 \cap \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2$ converges to one exponentially fast. On this event, we have shown that the estimator $\hat{\theta}_u^\tau$ is the unique minimizer of (5) and that it consistently estimates the signed non-zero pattern of the true parameter vector θ_u^τ , i.e., it consistently estimates the neighborhood of a node u . Applying the union bound over all nodes $u \in V$, we can conclude that our estimation procedure explained in Section 2 consistently estimates the graph structure at a time point τ .

6. Conclusion. In the paper we focus on sparsistent estimation of the time-varying high-dimensional graph structure in Markov Random Fields from a small size sample. This work builds on the previous work of Ravikumar et al. [21] which analyzed the invariant graph structure estimation from the *i.i.d.* sample. Our main contribution is the new nonparametric procedure applicable to much more realistic scenarios in which the data generating process changes over time and the sufficient conditions under which our procedure succeeds in recovering the unknown time-evolving graph structure.

An interesting open direction is estimation of the graph structure from a general time-series, where observations are dependant. In our opinion, the graph structure that changes with time creates the biggest technical difficulties. Incorporating dependant observations would be an easier problem to address, however, the one of great practical importance, since samples in the real data sets are likely to be dependant. Another open direction is to establish necessary conditions, to complement sufficient conditions established here, under which it is possible to estimate a time-varying graph structure. In this work we have assumed that the distribution changes smoothly, an assumption more realistic than the assumption that the distribution is time-invariant, however, it may still be invalid for real datasets. Under the assumption that the distribution generating observations undergoes a number of shifts, it would be interesting to modify the current approach to allow for use of a change-point detection framework to estimate a sequence of graph structures.

7. Appendix. Note that in what follows, we use C, C' and C'' to denote positive constants and their value may change from line to line.

7.1. *Proof of Lemma 2.* We start the proof by bounding the difference $|\eta(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^{t+\delta}) - \eta(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t)|$ which will be useful later on. By applying the mean value theorem to $\eta(\mathbf{x}; \cdot)$ and the Taylor expansion on $\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^{t+\delta}) - \eta(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t)| &= \left| \sum_{v=1}^{p-1} (\theta_{uv}^{t+\delta} - \theta_{uv}^t) \eta'(\mathbf{x}; \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^{(v)}) \right| \quad \left(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^{(v)} \text{ is a point on the line} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{between } \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^{t+\delta} \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{v=1}^{p-1} |\theta_{uv}^{t+\delta} - \theta_{uv}^t| \quad (|\eta'(\mathbf{x}; \cdot)| \leq 1) \\ &= \sum_{v=1}^{p-1} \left| \delta \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \theta_{uv}^t + \frac{\delta^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \theta_{uv}^t \right|_{t=\beta_v} \quad \left(\beta_v \text{ is a point on the line} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{between } t \text{ and } t + \delta \right) \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, let $\tau = 1$. Using the above equation, and the Riemann integral to approximate the sum, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau) x_v^t x_{v'}^t - \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t) x_v^t x_{v'}^t \right| \\ & \approx \left| \int \frac{2}{h} K\left(\frac{z-\tau}{h}\right) [\eta(\mathbf{x}^z; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau) - \eta(\mathbf{x}^z; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^z)] x_v^z x_{v'}^z dz \right| \\ & \leq 2 \int_{-\frac{1}{h}}^0 K(z') |\eta(\mathbf{x}^{\tau+z'h}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau) - \eta(\mathbf{x}^{\tau+z'h}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^{\tau+z'h})| dz' \\ & \leq 2 \int_{-1}^0 K(z') \left[\sum_{v=1}^{p-1} \left| z'h \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \theta_{uv}^t \right|_{t=\tau} + \frac{(z'h)^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \theta_{uv}^t \right|_{t=\beta_v} \right] dz' \\ & \leq Csh, \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending on M from A3 which bounds the derivatives in the equation above, and M_K from A4 which bounds the kernel. The last inequality follows from the assumption that the number of non-zero components of the vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t$ is bounded by s .

Next, we prove equation (13). Using the Taylor expansion, for any fixed $1 \leq v, v' \leq p-1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E}[\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t) x_v^t x_{v'}^t] - q_{vv'}^\tau| \\ & = \left| \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau (q_{vv'}^t - q_{vv'}^\tau) \right| \\ & = \left| \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \left((t-\tau) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} q_{vv'}^t \Big|_{t=\tau} + \frac{(t-\tau)^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} q_{vv'}^t \Big|_{t=\xi} \right) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi \in [t, \tau]$. Since $w_t^\tau = 0$ for $|t - \tau| > h$, we have

$$\max_{v, v'} |\mathbb{E}[\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t) x_v^t x_{v'}^t] - q_{vv'}^\tau| \leq C'h$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending on M and M_K only.

Finally, we prove equation (14). Observe that $w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t) x_v^t x_{v'}^t$ are independent and bounded random variables $[-w_t^\tau, w_t^\tau]$. The equation simply follows from the Hoeffding's inequality. $\square$

7.2. Proof of Lemma 3. To obtain the Lemma, we follow the same proof strategy as in the proof of Lemma 2. In particular, Eq. (17) is proved in the same way as Eq. (13) and Eq. (18) in the same way as Eq. (14). The details of this derivation are omitted. $\square$

7.3. Proof of Lemma 4. The set of minima $\Theta(\lambda_n)$ of a convex function is convex. So, for two distinct points of minima, $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u$, every point on the line connecting two points also belongs to minima, i.e. $\xi \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u + (1 - \xi) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u \in \Theta(\lambda_n)$, for any $\xi \in (0, 1)$. Let $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u$ and now any point on the line can be written as $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u + \xi \boldsymbol{\eta}$. The value of the objective at any point of minima is constant and we have

$$F(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u + \xi \boldsymbol{\eta}) = c, \quad \xi \in (0, 1),$$

where c is some constant. By taking the derivative with respect to ξ of $F(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u + \xi \boldsymbol{\eta})$ we obtain

$$(32) \quad \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \left[-x_u^t + \frac{\exp(\langle \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u + \xi \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \rangle) - \exp(-\langle \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u + \xi \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \rangle)}{\exp(\langle \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u + \xi \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \rangle) + \exp(-\langle \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u + \xi \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \rangle)} \right] \langle \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \rangle \\ + \lambda_n \sum_{v=1}^{p-1} \eta_v \text{sign}(\tilde{\theta}_{uv} + \xi \eta_v) = 0.$$

On a small neighborhood of ξ the sign of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u + \xi \boldsymbol{\eta}$ is constant, for each component v , since the function $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u + \xi \boldsymbol{\eta}$ is continuous in ξ . By taking the derivative with respect to ξ of Eq. (32) and noting that the last term is constant on a small neighborhood of ξ we have

$$4 \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \langle \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \rangle^2 \frac{\exp(-2\langle \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u + \xi \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \rangle)}{(1 + \exp(-2\langle \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u + \xi \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \rangle))^2} = 0.$$

This implies that $\langle \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \rangle = 0$ for every $t \in \mathcal{T}_n$, which implies that $\langle \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t, \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u \rangle = \langle \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u \rangle$, $t \in \mathcal{T}_n$, for any two solutions $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u$. Since $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u$ were two arbitrary elements of $\Theta(\lambda_n)$ we can conclude that $\langle \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_u \rangle$, $t \in \mathcal{T}_n$ is constant for all elements $\boldsymbol{\theta}_u \in \Theta(\lambda_n)$.

Next, we need to show that the conclusion from above implies that any two solutions have non-zero elements in the same position. From equation (20), it follows that the set of non-zero components of the solution is given by

$$S = \left\{ 1 \leq v \leq p-1 : \left| \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau (\nabla \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u; \mathbf{x}^t))_v \right| = \lambda \right\}.$$

Using equation (21) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau (\nabla \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t))_v &= \\ \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau (\mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \{x_u^t + 1 - 2 \frac{\exp(2x_u^t \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \rangle)}{\exp(2x_u^t \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^\tau \rangle) + 1}\})_v, \end{aligned}$$

which is constant across different elements $\boldsymbol{\theta}_u \in \Theta(\lambda_n)$, since $\langle \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_u \rangle$, $t \in \mathcal{T}_n$ is constant for all $\boldsymbol{\theta}_u \in \Theta(\lambda_n)$. This implies that the set of non-zero components is the same for all solutions. $\square$

7.4. *Proof of Lemma 5.* Under the assumptions given in the Lemma, we can apply the result of Lemma 3. Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^s$ be a unit norm minimal eigenvector of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{SS}^\tau$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{SS}^\tau) &= \min_{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2=1} \mathbf{x}' \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{SS}^\tau \mathbf{x} \\ &= \min_{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2=1} \{ \mathbf{x}' \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{SS}^\tau \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}' (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{SS}^\tau - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{SS}^\tau) \mathbf{x} \} \\ &\leq \mathbf{y}' \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{SS}^\tau \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{y}' (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{SS}^\tau - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{SS}^\tau) \mathbf{y}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\Lambda_{\min}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{SS}^\tau) \geq D_{\min} - \|(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{SS}^\tau - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{SS}^\tau)\|_2.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^\tau = [\sigma_{uv}^\tau]$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^\tau = [\hat{\sigma}_{uv}^\tau]$. We have the following bound on the spectral norm

$$\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{SS}^\tau - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{SS}^\tau\|_2 \leq \left(\sum_{u=1}^s \sum_{v=1}^s (\hat{\sigma}_{uv}^\tau - \sigma_{uv}^\tau)^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \delta,$$

with the probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-Cnh(\frac{\delta}{s} - C'h)^2 + C'' \log(s))$, for some fixed constants $C, C', C'' > 0$ depending on M and M_K only.

Similarly, we have that

$$\Lambda_{\max}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{SS}^\tau) \leq D_{\max} + \delta,$$

with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-Cnh(\frac{\delta}{s} - C'h)^2 + C'' \log(s))$, for some fixed constants $C, C', C'' > 0$ depending on M and M_K only.

From Lemma 4, we know that any two solutions $\bar{\theta}_u, \tilde{\theta}_u \in \Theta(\lambda_n)$ of the optimization problem (5) have non-zero elements in the same position. So, for any two solutions $\bar{\theta}_u, \tilde{\theta}_u \in \Theta(\lambda_n)$, it holds

$$\mathbf{X}_{\setminus u}(\bar{\theta}_u - \tilde{\theta}_u) = \mathbf{X}_{\setminus u, S}(\bar{\theta}_u - \tilde{\theta}_u)_S + \mathbf{X}_{\setminus u, S^c}(\bar{\theta}_u - \tilde{\theta}_u)_{S^c} = \mathbf{X}_{\setminus u, S}(\bar{\theta}_u - \tilde{\theta}_u)_S.$$

Furthermore, from Lemma 4 we know that the two solutions are in the kernel of $\mathbf{X}_{\setminus u, S}$. On the event Ω_{01} , kernel of $\mathbf{X}_{\setminus u, S}$ is $\{0\}$. Thus, the solution is unique on Ω_{01} . $\square$

7.5. *Proof of Lemma 6.* We first analyze the probability of the event Ω_{02} . Using the same argument to those in the proof of Lemma 5, we obtain

$$\Lambda_{\min}(\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau) \geq C_{\min} - \|\mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau\|_2.$$

Next, using results of Lemma 2, we have the following bound

$$(33) \quad \|\mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau\|_2 \leq \left(\sum_{u=1}^s \sum_{v=1}^s (\hat{q}_{uv}^\tau - q_{uv}^\tau)^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \delta,$$

with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-C \frac{nh\delta^2}{s^2} + 2 \log(s))$, for some fixed constants $C, C' > 0$ depending on M and M_K only.

Next, we deal with the event Ω_{03} . We are going to use the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{S^c S}^\tau (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} &= \mathbf{Q}_{S^c S}^\tau [(\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} - (\mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1}] \\ &\quad + [\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{S^c S}^\tau - \mathbf{Q}_{S^c S}^\tau] (\mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \\ &\quad + [\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{S^c S}^\tau - \mathbf{Q}_{S^c S}^\tau] [(\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} - (\mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1}] \\ &\quad + \mathbf{Q}_{S^c S}^\tau (\mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} \\ &= T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + T_4. \end{aligned}$$

Under the assumption A2, we have that $\|T_4\|_\infty \leq 1 - \alpha$. The lemma follows if we prove that for all the other terms we have $\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq \frac{\alpha}{6}$. Using the submultiplicative property of the norm, we have for the first term:

$$(34) \quad \begin{aligned} \|T_1\|_\infty &\leq \|\mathbf{Q}_{S^c S}^\tau (\mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1}\|_\infty \|\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau - \mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau\|_\infty \|(\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1}\|_\infty \\ &\leq (1 - \alpha) \|\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau - \mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau\|_\infty \sqrt{s} \|(\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1}\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Using Eq. (33), we can bound the term $\|(\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1}\|_2 \leq C''$, for some constant depending on $C_{\min}$ only, with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-C \frac{nh}{s} +$

$2\log(s)$), for some fixed constant $C > 0$. The bound on the term $\|\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau - \mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau\|_\infty$ follows from application of Lemma 2. Observe that

$$(35) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\|\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau - \mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau\|_\infty \geq \delta] &= \mathbb{P}[\max_{v \in S} \{ \sum_{v' \in S} |\hat{q}_{vv'}^\tau - q_{vv'}^\tau| \} \geq \delta] \\ &\leq 2 \exp(-Cnh(\frac{\delta}{s} - C'sh)^2 + 2\log(s)), \end{aligned}$$

for some fixed constants $C, C' > 0$. Combining all the elements, we obtain the bound on the first term $\|T_1\|_\infty \leq \frac{\alpha}{6}$, with probability at least $1 - C \exp(C' \frac{nh}{s^3} + C'' \log(s))$, for some constants $C, C', C'' > 0$.

Next, we analyze the second term. We have that

$$(36) \quad \begin{aligned} \|T_2\|_\infty &\leq \|\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{S^cS}^\tau - \mathbf{Q}_{S^cS}^\tau\|_\infty \sqrt{s} \|(\mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1}\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{s}}{C_{\min}} \|\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{S^cS}^\tau - \mathbf{Q}_{S^cS}^\tau\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

The bound on the term $\|\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau - \mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau\|_\infty$ follows in the same way as the bound in Eq. (35) and we can conclude that $\|T_3\|_\infty \leq \frac{\alpha}{6}$ with probability at least $1 - C \exp(C' \frac{nh}{s^3} + C'' \log(p))$, for some constants $C, C', C'' > 0$.

Finally, we bound the third term T_3 . We have the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} &\|[\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{S^cS}^\tau - \mathbf{Q}_{S^cS}^\tau][(\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1} - (\mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1}]\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{S^cS}^\tau - \mathbf{Q}_{S^cS}^\tau\|_\infty \sqrt{s} \|(\mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1}[\mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau](\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1}\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{s}}{C_{\min}} \|\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{S^cS}^\tau - \mathbf{Q}_{S^cS}^\tau\|_\infty \|\mathbf{Q}_{SS}^\tau - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau\|_2 \|(\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{SS}^\tau)^{-1}\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Bounding the remaining terms as in equations (36), (35) and (34), we obtain that $\|T_3\|_\infty \leq \frac{\alpha}{6}$ with probability at least $1 - C \exp(C' \frac{nh}{s^3} + C'' \log(p))$.

Bound on the probability of event Ω_{03} follows from combining the bounds on all terms. $\square$

7.6. Proof of Lemma 9. To prove this Lemma, we use a technique of Rothman et al. [23] applied to the problem of consistency of the penalized covariance matrix estimator. Let us define the following function

$$H : \begin{cases} \mathbb{R}^p & \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \mathbf{D} & \mapsto F(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau + \mathbf{D}) - F(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau), \end{cases}$$

where the function $F(\cdot)$ is defined in equation (19). The function $H(\cdot)$ takes the following form

$$\begin{aligned} H(\mathbf{D}) &= \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau (\gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t) - \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau + \mathbf{D}; \mathbf{x}^t)) \\ &\quad + \lambda_n (\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau + \mathbf{D}\|_1 - \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau\|_1). \end{aligned}$$

Recall the minimizer of (5) constructed in the proof of Proposition 7, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau = (\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}'_S, 0'_{S^c})'$. The minimizer of the function $H(\cdot)$ is $\hat{\mathbf{D}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_u^\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau$. Function $H(\cdot)$ is convex and $H(0) = 0$ by construction. Therefore $H(\hat{\mathbf{D}}) \leq 0$. If we show that for some radius $B > 0$, and $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with $\|\mathbf{D}\|_2 = B$ and $\mathbf{D}_{S^c} = \mathbf{0}$, we have $H(\mathbf{D}) > 0$, then we claim that $\|\hat{\mathbf{D}}\|_2 \leq B$. This follows from the convexity of $H(\cdot)$.

We proceed to show strict positivity of $H(\cdot)$ on the boundary of the ball with radius $B = K\lambda_n\sqrt{s}$, where $K > 0$ is a parameter to be chosen wisely later. Let $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be an arbitrary vector with $\|\mathbf{D}\|_2 = B$ and $\mathbf{D}_{S^c} = \mathbf{0}$, then by the Taylor expansion of $\gamma(\cdot; \mathbf{x}^t)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
H(\mathbf{D}) &= -\left(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \nabla \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t)\right)' \mathbf{D} \\
&\quad - \mathbf{D}' \left[\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau + \alpha \mathbf{D}) \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^{t'} \right] \mathbf{D} \\
&\quad + \lambda_n (\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau + \mathbf{D}\|_1 - \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau\|_1) \\
&= (I) + (II) + (III),
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

for some $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.

We start from the term (I). Let $\mathbf{e}_v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be a unit vector with one at the position v and zeros elsewhere. Then random variables $-\mathbf{e}_v' \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \nabla \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t)$ are bounded $[-\frac{C}{nh}, \frac{C}{nh}]$ for all $1 \leq v \leq p-1$, with constant $C > 0$ depending on M_K only. Using the Hoeffding inequality and the union bound, we have

$$\max_{1 \leq v \leq p-1} |\mathbf{e}_v' \left(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \nabla \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t) - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \nabla \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t) \right] \right)| \leq \delta,$$

with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-Cnh\delta^2 + \log(p))$, where $C > 0$ is a constant depending on M_K only. Moreover, denoting

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t) = \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t}[x_u^t = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t]$$

to simplify the notation, we have for all $1 \leq v \leq p-1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_v' \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \nabla \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t) \mid \{\mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n}]| \\
&= |\mathbb{E}[\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau x_v^t [x_u^t + 1 - 2p(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau)] \mid \{\mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n}]| \\
&= |2 \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau x_v^t [p(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^t) - p(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau)]| \\
&\leq 4 \int_{-\frac{1}{h}}^0 K(z) |p(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^{\tau+zh}) - p(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau)| dz.
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Next, we apply the mean value theorem on $p(\cdot)$ and the Taylor's theorem on θ_u^t . Under the assumption A3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (39) \quad & |p(\theta_u^{\tau+zh}) - p(\theta_u^\tau)| \\
 & \leq \sum_{v=1}^{p-1} |\theta_{uv}^{\tau+zh} - \theta_{uv}^\tau| \quad (|p'(\cdot)| \leq 1) \\
 & = \sum_{v=1}^{p-1} \left| zh \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \theta_{uv}^t \Big|_{t=\tau} + \frac{(zh)^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \theta_{uv}^t \Big|_{t=\alpha_v} \right| \quad (\alpha_v \in [\tau+zh, \tau]) \\
 & \leq Cs |zh + \frac{(zh)^2}{2}|,
 \end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$ depending only on M . Combining (39) and (38) we have that $|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}'_v \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \nabla \gamma(\theta_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t)]| \leq Csh$ for all $1 \leq v \leq p-1$. Thus, with probability greater than $1 - 2\exp(-Cnh(\lambda_n - sh)^2 + \log(p))$ for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on M_K, M and α , which under the conditions of Theorem 1 goes to 1 exponentially fast, we have

$$\max_{1 \leq v \leq p-1} |\mathbf{e}'_v \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \nabla \gamma(\theta_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t)| \leq \frac{\alpha \lambda_n}{4(2-\alpha)} < \frac{\lambda_n}{4}.$$

On that event, using Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \nabla \gamma(\theta_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t))' \mathbf{D}| & \leq \|\mathbf{D}\|_1 \max_{1 \leq v \leq p-1} |\mathbf{e}'_v \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \nabla \gamma(\theta_u^\tau; \mathbf{x}^t)| \\
 & \leq \frac{\lambda_n}{4} \sqrt{s} \|\mathbf{D}\|_2 \leq (\lambda_n \sqrt{s})^2 \frac{K}{4}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The triangle inequality applied to the term (III) of equation (37) yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lambda_n (\|\theta_u^\tau + \mathbf{D}\|_1 - \|\theta_u^\tau\|_1) & \geq -\lambda_n \|\mathbf{D}_S\|_1 \\
 & \geq -\lambda_n \sqrt{s} \|\mathbf{D}_S\|_2 \geq -K(\lambda_n \sqrt{s})^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we bound the term (II) of equation (37). Observe that since $\mathbf{D}_{Sc} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbf{D}' [\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \theta_u^\tau + \alpha \mathbf{D}) \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^t \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u}^{t'}] \mathbf{D} \\
 & = \mathbf{D}'_S [\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \theta_u^\tau + \alpha \mathbf{D}) \mathbf{x}_S^t \mathbf{x}_S^{t'}] \mathbf{D}_S \\
 & \geq K^2 \Lambda_{\min} (\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \theta_u^\tau + \alpha \mathbf{D}) \mathbf{x}_S^t \mathbf{x}_S^{t'})
 \end{aligned}$$

Let $g : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be defined as $g(z) = \frac{4 \exp(2z)}{(1 + \exp(2z))^2}$. Now, $\eta(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u) = g(x_u \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_u, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus u} \rangle)$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Lambda_{\min} \left(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau + \alpha \mathbf{D}) \mathbf{x}_S^t \mathbf{x}_S^{t'} \right) \\
& \geq \min_{\alpha \in [0,1]} \Lambda_{\min} \left(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau + \alpha \mathbf{D}) \mathbf{x}_S^t \mathbf{x}_S^{t'} \right) \\
& \geq \Lambda_{\min} \left(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau) \mathbf{x}_S^t \mathbf{x}_S^{t'} \right) \\
& \quad - \max_{\alpha \in [0,1]} \left\| \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau g'(x_u^t \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau + \alpha \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{x}_S^t \rangle) (x_u^t \mathbf{D}'_S \mathbf{x}_S^t) \mathbf{x}_S^t \mathbf{x}_S^{t'} \right\|_2 \\
& \geq C_{\min} - \max_{\alpha \in [0,1]} \left\| \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau g'(x_u^t \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau + \alpha \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{x}_S^t \rangle) (x_u^t \mathbf{D}'_S \mathbf{x}_S^t) \mathbf{x}_S^t \mathbf{x}_S^{t'} \right\|_2
\end{aligned}$$

To bound the spectral norm, we observe that for any fixed $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^s, \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 = 1$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{y}' \left\{ \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau g'(x_u^t \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau + \alpha \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{x}_S^t \rangle) (x_u^t \mathbf{D}'_S \mathbf{x}_S^t) \mathbf{x}_S^t \mathbf{x}_S^{t'} \right\} \mathbf{y} \\
& = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau g'(x_u^t \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau + \alpha \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{x}_S^t \rangle) (x_u^t \mathbf{D}'_S \mathbf{x}_S^t) (\mathbf{x}_S^{t'} \mathbf{y})^2 \\
& \leq \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau |g'(x_u^t \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau + \alpha \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{x}_S^t \rangle) (x_u^t \mathbf{D}'_S \mathbf{x}_S^t)| (\mathbf{x}_S^{t'} \mathbf{y})^2 \\
& \leq \sqrt{s} \|\mathbf{D}\|_2 \left\| \sum_t w_t^\tau \mathbf{x}_S^t \mathbf{x}_S^{t'} \right\|_2 \quad (|g'(\cdot)| \leq 1) \\
& \leq D_{\max} K \lambda_n s \leq \frac{C_{\min}}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows as long as $\lambda_n s \leq \frac{C_{\min}}{2D_{\max}K}$. We have shown that

$$\Lambda_{\min} \left(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_n} w_t^\tau \eta(\mathbf{x}^t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_u^\tau + \alpha \mathbf{D}) \mathbf{x}_S^t \mathbf{x}_S^{t'} \right) \geq \frac{C_{\min}}{2},$$

with high probability.

Putting the bounds on the three terms together, we have

$$H(\mathbf{D}) \geq (\lambda_n \sqrt{s})^2 \left\{ -\frac{1}{4}K + \frac{C_{\min}}{2}K^2 - K \right\},$$

which is strictly positive for $K = \frac{5}{C_{\min}}$. For this choice of K , we have that $\lambda_n s \leq \frac{C_{\min}^2}{10D_{\max}}$, which holds under the conditions of Theorem 1 for n large enough. $\square$

References.

- [1] Pieter Abbeel, Daphne Koller, and Andrew Y. Ng. Learning factor graphs in polynomial time and sample complexity. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 7:1743–1788, 2006.
- [2] O. Banerjee, L. El Ghaoui, and A. d’Aspremont. Model selection through sparse maximum likelihood estimation. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 9:485–516, 2008.
- [3] Peter J. Bickel and Elizaveta Levina. Covariance regularization by thresholding. *ANNALS OF STATISTICS*, 36:2577, 2008.
- [4] Peter J. Bickel and Elizaveta Levina. Regularized estimation of large covariance matrices. *ANNALS OF STATISTICS*, 36:199, 2008.
- [5] Guy Bresler, Elchanan Mossel, and Allan Sly. Reconstruction of markov random fields from samples: Some easy observations and algorithms. *CoRR*, abs/0712.1402, 2007.
- [6] David Maxwell Chickering. Learning bayesian networks is np-complete. In *Learning from Data: Artificial Intelligence and Statistics V*, pages 121–130. Springer-Verlag, 1996.
- [7] C. Chow and C. Liu. Approximating discrete probability distributions with dependence trees. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 14(3):462–467, 1968.
- [8] William S. Cleveland, Eric Grosse, and William M. Shyu. Local regression models. In John M. Chambers and Trevor J. Hastie, editors, *Statistical Models in S*, pages 309–376 (of xv + 608), 1991.
- [9] Imre Csiszar and Zsolt Talata. Consistent estimation of the basic neighborhood of markov random fields. *ANNALS OF STATISTICS*, 34:123, 2006.
- [10] Mathias Drton and Michael D. Perlman. Model selection for Gaussian concentration graphs. *Biometrika*, 91(3):591–602, 2004.
- [11] J. Duchi, S. Gould, and D. Koller. Projected subgradient methods for learning sparse gaussians. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-fourth Conference on Uncertainty in AI (UAI)*, 2008.
- [12] J. Fan, Y. Feng, and Y. Wu. Network exploration via the adaptive lasso and scad penalties. *Annals of Applied Statistics*, to appear, December 2008.
- [13] Jianqing Fan and Qiwei Yao. *Nonlinear Time Series: Nonparametric and Parametric Methods*. (Springer Series in Statistics). Springer, August 2005.
- [14] J. Friedman, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani. Sparse inverse covariance estimation with the graphical lasso. *Biostat*, page kxm045, 2007.
- [15] J. Friedman, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani. Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent, 2008.
- [16] L. Getoor and B. Taskar. *Introduction to Statistical Relational Learning (Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning)*. The MIT Press, August 2007.
- [17] T. Hastie and R. Tibshirani. Varying-coefficient models, 1993.
- [18] Nouredine El Karoui. Operator norm consistent estimation of large-dimensional sparse covariance matrices. *ANNALS OF STATISTICS*, 36:2717, 2008.
- [19] N. Meinshausen and P. Bühlmann. High-dimensional graphs and variable selection with the lasso. *Annals of Statistics*, 34:1436, 2006.
- [20] Jie Peng, Pei Wang, Nengfeng Zhou, and Ji Zhu. Partial correlation estimation by joint sparse regression models. 2008.
- [21] Pradeep Ravikumar, Martin J. Wainwright, and John D. Lafferty. High-dimensional ising model selection using ℓ_1 regularized logistic regression. *Annals of Statistics*, to appear, 2009.
- [22] Pradeep Ravikumar, Martin J. Wainwright, Garvesh Raskutti, and Bin Yu. High-dimensional covariance estimation by minimizing ℓ_1 -penalized log-determinant di-

- vergence. Nov 2008.
- [23] Adam J. Rothman, Peter J. Bickel, Elizaveta Levina, and Ji Zhu. Sparse permutation invariant covariance estimation. *ELECTRONIC JOURNAL OF STATISTICS*, 2:494, 2008.
 - [24] Nathan Srebro. Maximum likelihood bounded tree-width markov networks. In *UAI '01: Proceedings of the 17th Conference in Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 504–511, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2001. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
 - [25] Cun-Hui Zhang Tony Cai and Harrison H. Zhou. Optimal rates of convergence for covariance matrix estimation. Technical report, October 2008.
 - [26] Martin J. Wainwright and Michael I. Jordan. Graphical models, exponential families, and variational inference. *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.*, 1(1-2):1–305, 2008.
 - [27] Wei Biao Wu and Mohsen Pourahmadi. Nonparametric estimation of large covariance matrices of longitudinal data. *Biometrika*, 90(4):831–844, December 2003.
 - [28] Ming Yuan and Yi Lin. Model selection and estimation in the Gaussian graphical model. *Biometrika*, page asm018, 2007.
 - [29] Shuheng Zhou, John Lafferty, and Larry Wasserman. Time varying undirected graphs. In Rocco A. Servedio and Tong Zhang, editors, *COLT*, pages 455–466. Omnipress, 2008.

ADDRESS OF THE AUTHORS
 5000 FORBES AVE, WEAN HALL 4212
 PITTSBURGH, PA 15213
 E-MAIL: mladenk@cs.cmu.edu
epxing@cs.cmu.edu